

Relaxation to Spin Glass Ground State in One to Six Dimensions

Dietrich Stauffer* and Paulo Murilo Castro de Oliveira

Institute of Physics, Fluminense Federal University

Av. Litorânea s/n, Boa Viagem, Niterói, RJ 24210-340, Brazil

Abstract: In the $\pm J$ Edwards-Anderson spin glass, we find by Monte Carlo simulation the (approximate) ground state energy. Also we check how in the relaxation towards this ground state the fraction of never flipped spins diminishes with time.

Spin glass simulations are now a classical problem of computational statistical physics [1]. In the $\pm J$ Edwards-Anderson spin glass with energy $\sum J_{ik} S_i S_k$, the nearest neighbor couplings J_{ik} between the spins $S_i = \pm 1$ are randomly $+J$ and $-J$ with equal probabilities. The one-dimensional chain can be mathematically transformed into a chain of Ising magnets, whereas in two and more dimensions frustration appears. In three and more dimensions a phase transition at finite temperature exists, which above six dimensions should belong to the universality class of mean field theory. The present work concerns the zero-temperature behavior only, which is also far from trivial. A ground state here is meant to be a configuration which does not have a measurably higher energy than the lowest possible energy.

Of the numerous ways to find the ground state (transfer matrix, simulated annealing, ...), three were recently motivated by biological analogies in the evolution of species: According to Darwinistic selection of the fittest, random mutations lead to fitter individuals. The maximum fitness then corresponds to the minimum energy of the spin glass [2]. In all three approaches, a biological mutation corresponds to a spin flip. Rodrigues and de Oliveira [3] combined energy-lowering mutations with an oscillating infinitesimal field to flip the “free” spins in its direction, i.e. those spins whose energy would not change by a flip in zero magnetic field; we refer to that paper for a justification of these oscillations which are avoided here. Stauffer and Stevens et al [4] allowed for rare mutations which increase the energy; this method corresponds to simulated annealing in the limit of infinitesimally low temperature. Sutton et al [5] combined these mutations with a genetic algorithm, thus including sex which Stauffer [4] missed. In two dimensions, ref.5 found within the error bars the desired ground state energy whereas ref.4 without sex found only a slightly higher, metastable energy. Thus ref.5 gave the best ground state energies. The methods of ref.4 and 5 require a computer time growing with increasing system size faster than the number of spins involved; therefore they and also ref.3 used relatively small lattices. The aim of the present work is to simplify the method of ref.3, to apply it to larger systems and higher dimensions, and to see how the relaxation of these spin glasses compares with that of Ising ferromagnets at zero temperature [6].

Suppose we have n free spins in some configuration S_0 , after all spins on the square lattice with 3 or 4 surrounding excited (= broken) bonds are flipped. This state is not a truly metastable state in the usual sense: not necessarily all its neighboring states (differing from it by only one flipped spin) have a higher energy. Instead, we have now n such neighboring states $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n$ with the same energy as S_0 . Each one is reachable from S_0 by flipping just one of its n free spins. Any of these n new states, called S_i , can have some spin(s) surrounded by three excited bonds, unlike S_0 ; this spin will be in the neighborhood of the spin which was flipped compared to S_0 . If this is the case, the energy

can be further decreased simply by flipping this spin. Otherwise, let k be the number of further free spins of configuration S_i . Now we have k neighboring states $S_{i,1}, S_{i,2}, \dots, S_{i,k}$ of S_i with the same energy as S_i and S_0 . All of them are second neighbors of S_0 in configuration space. Again, one of them may have some spins with three broken bonds, allowing a further reduction of the energy, and so on. This means we have a ramified set of possibilities for further energy minimization, always through single mutations (one spin flip at each step) and never increasing the energy (Darwinistic selection). The flips of free spins correspond to mutations which do not change the fitness if taken alone, but which may lead to increased fitness in combination with other, later mutations. There are many ways to explore these bifurcating minimization paths along the rugged energy landscape. Ref.3 adopted the iteratively reversed infinitesimal magnetic field, and now we use the following simplified version.

Ref.3 flipped spins with a probability of 50 percent if and only if this flip lowers the energy. To deal with those spins which otherwise would have a vanishing flip energy (free spins), a homogeneous magnetic field was applied in one direction until no more spin flips occurred; then the field was reversed until again equilibrium was reached, and this changing of the field direction was repeated again and again until the resulting energy no longer changed measurably. On the square lattice an energy of 0.16 was achieved, compared with the literature value[1] of 0.15 and as good as the approximation 0.16 of Stauffer[4]. (We normalize the energy to the interval between zero and unity, with zero corresponding to the case where all bonds are satisfied, and unity to the opposite case of all bonds broken.) Now we found it not necessary to waste 50 percent of the flips, and instead of flipping all free spins in the same direction (of the homogeneous infinitesimal field) we flip them randomly, half up and half down. Spins were updated sequentially by going through the lattice like a typewriter. This algorithm thus corresponds to the zero-temperature limit of Glauber or heat bath kinetics used also in ref.6: If a flip lowers the energy it is always made, if it increases the energy it is never made, and if it keeps the energy constant it is made with probability 1/2. As discussed in ref.3, the flipping of the free spins gets the system out of many if not all local energy minima which are obtained if only flips lowering the energy are allowed; the latter method gives an energy of 0.24 instead of 0.15 on the square lattice.

(By avoiding the method of oscillating homogeneous fields we decreased only slightly the computer time per Monte Carlo step. But instead of making 8000 iterations for one field direction, followed by another 8000 for the opposite direction, and repeating this cycle again and again, we now just use the Glauber or heat bath algorithm at $T = 0$ for one stretch of 1000 (or more) iterations and extrapolated from these data to infinite time. Thus lots of computer time was saved compared with ref.3.)

Using one Fortran program working in one to six dimensions, we found the one-dimensional energy to relax as $1/\sqrt{t}$ towards $\pm 10^{-3}$, i.e. eventually all bonds are satisfied since no frustration occurs. In higher dimensions the effective exponent for the time t was somewhat higher, and the energies extrapolated after $t = 1000$ sweeps through a lattice of a million spins were 0.158, 0.211, 0.290, 0.271, and 0.246 in two to six dimensions on hypercubic lattices. In two and three dimensions we would have liked to have 0.150 and 0.205, while we are not aware of previous ground state estimates in higher dimensions. For

smaller lattices, we note that slight further energy decrements occur simply by taking larger and larger numbers of lattice sweeps. Nevertheless this is prohibitively time consuming, and presumably still will not lead to the true ground states.

(We made one run each for $L = 5 \cdot 10^6$, 2000, 150, 31, 17, and 10 in one to six dimensions, 100 runs for 63^3 , 15^4 , 11^5 and 7^6 , and 4000 runs for 64^2 and estimate the errors in our energies to be of the order 0.001 or better.)

The fraction of spins which were never flipped decayed with time t as $t^{-0.37}$ towards zero in one dimension whereas in two to six dimensions this fraction approached about one quarter, if we start with all spins up or all spins random. This one-dimensional power law agrees with that of ferromagnets [6], but in two and three dimensions the ferromagnets had this fraction also going to zero. Thus only for higher dimensions do spin glass and ferromagnet agree again with a finite fraction of stable spins. Similarly to the two dimensional case [3], we find the rms fluctuations of the energy varying roughly as $L^{-d/2}$ also in higher dimensions, similar to random processes, where L is the system linear dimension.

The finite fraction of never flipped spins on the square lattice does not seem to be due to insufficient computing time. For $L = 31$ we looked at the number of never flipped spins after 10, 31, 100, 316, 1000, 3162, 10000, 31624, and 100000 sweeps through the lattice, and found it to converge: 357, 287, 253, 212, 206, 204, 202, and 202, respectively, amounting to between one fourth and one fifth of the 961 spins involved here. Thus there is no constant decrement on this logarithmic time scale.

We believe that even for infinite times our method would not lead to the true ground state. With our method the system leaves a metastable energy minimum only if another configuration exists which can be reached by one spin flip and which does not increase the energy. If we are in a minimum which requires flipping at least one spin against the wishes of its neighbors, then these neighbors prevent the system to leave this metastable minimum. Ref.4 allows one spin flip, but never two or more at the same time, against the energy, but keeps the free spins unchanged. This method works about as good as the present one with respect to the final energy in two dimensions; a combination of both tricks might work better but still would not be exact. The genetic algorithm of ref.5 seems to circumvent even these energy barriers for metastable states and may lead to the true ground state.

Since submission of the paper, Gropengiesser [7] got better results by combining the present flipping of free spins with the mutations of ref.4 to find the ground state energy, and on a parallel computer even got superlinear speedup. A more mathematical and very efficient algorithm was used by de Simone et al [8].

In summary, the fraction of never flipped spins only in one, five, and six dimensions behaved qualitatively as in ferromagnets. But this simple zero-temperature Glauber algorithm adapted from ref.3 seems to be a way to get good though not exact ground state energies with moderate computational effort even for large lattices.

We thank J.Kertész for suggesting to check the fraction of never flipped spins, and the Brazilian Education Ministry for a CAPES travel grant to DS.

* Present and permanent address: Institute for Theoretical Physics, Cologne University, D-50923 Köln, Germany

- [1] K.Binder and A.P. Young, Rev.Mod.Phys. 58, 801 (1986)
- [2] S.A.Kauffman, *The Origins of Order*, Oxford University Press, New York 1993
- [3] E.S.Rodrigues and P.M.C. de Oliveira, J.Stat.Phys. 74, 1265 (1994)
- [4] D.Stauffer, J.Stat.Phys. 74, 1293 (1994); M.Stevens, M.Cleary, and D.Stauffer, Physica A 208, 1 (1994)
- [5] P.Sutton, D.L.Hunter, and N.Jan, J.Physique I 4, 1281 (1994)
- [6] B.Derrida, A.J.Bray, and C.Godreche, J.Phys. A 27, L 357 (1994); D.Stauffer, J.Phys. A 27, 5029 (1994)
- [7] U.Gropengiesser, J.Stat.Phys. 79, 1005 (1995) and Int.J.Mod.Phys. C, in press
- [8] C.de Simone, M.Diehl, M.Jünger, P.Mutzel, G.Reinelt, G.Rinaldi, J.Stat.Phys., in press.